

• 54 • THE IMPACT OF RUSSIAN CULTURE ON SOVIET COMMUNISM

178  
771 God a wrathful, irate and revengeful Old Man, but the Church leaders themselves, affected by the conditions of their society, were inclined to emphasize the fear aspect of the Christian God rather than his love and compassion. They also tended to pre-occupy themselves with death, describing it as a terror-striking event. In some early Church sermons even the messengers of God, the angels, were represented in a terrifying manner:

[776] Then, two angels appear, sent by God for the soul. As soon as the soul has seen them, it will be horrified; all its image and beauty and face will change; feet and hands will be torpid, and the hearing as *with* the tongue will be chained by silence; and man will be all sorrowful and invalid and woeful; and afterwards, appears death. And then, with a terrible pain the soul will issue from the body . . .<sup>37</sup>

793  
776  
152 These feelings of anxieties and fears, combined perhaps with a strong sense of guilt of the Church leaders, are manifested in the life histories of most Russian saints. These people, as portrayed in their hagiographies, were being constantly threatened by temptations and intimidations of dreadful demons. Hallucinations about demons became very frequent among the monks, and struggle against demons became one of the main aspects of ascetic life. Whole herds of these fiends were sometimes seen by the ascetics. The demons would disguise themselves as humans, as angels, and even as Christ, or they would appear in their true beastly form.<sup>38</sup>

773 Consistent with this gloomy and terrifying view of life and death was also an apocalyptic picture of the end of the world as pictured by Church leaders. According to the old Russian sermons the end of the world was very near and it was to ensue in fire and floods of blood brought about by a wrathful and revengeful God, (a picture that strongly reminds one of the vision of the end of the world found in the beliefs of the steppe nomads of Central Asia):

Then undying fire will flow from the East to the West, devouring mountains, stones, trees, and the sea. The firmament will be dried up and turned like brick bats, and all existing things, except men, will melt in a like way by the rate of the fire. All the earth will be burned; and through this undying fire all mankind has to pass.

795 over the whole earth.<sup>1</sup> Through the support of the Church the  
 771 absolute power of the Emperor became sacred, all-comprising  
 779 and omnipresent. In the proclamation which announced his  
 643 reign after he has been solemnly anointed by the Patriarch it  
 was stated that he "proceeded from God, and not from man,"  
 and that to him, the "supreme master of the universe, absolute  
 obedience was due from all."<sup>2</sup>

795 It was this Messianic ideology of politico-religious proselytism  
 797 and world salvation which had united the Church and the state  
 177 that helped Byzantium to solidify its rule and to spread its influ-  
 ence and control over the neighboring countries. In conquered,  
 dependent and friendly territories numerous bishoprics of East-  
 ern rite were established whose function was to obtain the moral  
 support of the people for the Byzantine ruler. The conquered  
 people were allowed a certain degree of autonomy in their inter-  
 nal affairs and one of their privileges was the right of the use  
 of their native language in church rituals.

This politico-religious expansionism, however, had its weak-  
 nesses. The only tie that linked the subjected and the dependent  
 peoples with the central power was the Church. Thus, as soon  
 as the central power and the authority of the Byzantine Emperor  
 weakened as a result of internal feuds, palace revolutions, civil  
 wars, and invasions, some petty local potentates saw a chance to  
 emancipate themselves from Constantinople and proclaim them-  
 selves as sovereign rulers. Such a local lord following Byzantine  
 traditions would appoint from his own kinsmen bishops and  
 Patriarchs whose function was to anoint the new king, to  
 bestow upon him God-like qualities, and to sanctify his despotic  
 rule among the subjects.

795 It is this pattern of Church and state relations that also devel-  
 797 oped between Byzantium and Russia by the end of the tenth  
 648 century, when as a result of a political alliance with Byzantium  
 793 Prince Vladimir of Kiev was converted to Christianity.<sup>3</sup> A Greek  
 Metropolitan and a number of Greek Orthodox bishops were  
 subsequently sent to Russia. Having an eye on the control of  
 all other Russian principalities, the Byzantine Church bestowed  
 upon the Metropolitan of Kiev the authority over all Russian

## THE BYZANTINE CHURCH AND MUSCOVITE THEOCRACY

• 57 •

territories. He was adorned with the title of the "Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Russias,"<sup>4</sup> a symbolic beginning of Russian religious and political unity.

When the Tartars in the beginning of the thirteenth century imposed their overlordship over all Russian lands, lacking an efficient administration and interested not so much in governing as in tributes, they restored to the native princes their old titles and gave them the right to collect tributes for them. In this manner in the beginning of the fourteenth century Ivan Kalita of Moscow succeeded in obtaining a *yarlyk* (charter of privileges) in which the Tartar Kahn recognized Ivan as the *Veliky Knyaz* (Grand Prince). A few years later Ivan also became the chief collector of tributes for the Kahn in Russian lands.

In his function as chief farmer of internal revenues Ivan practiced extortion from his Russian subjects and acquired a great personal wealth. His riches enabled him to purchase entire domains and apanages, and to buy the protection and backing of the Kahn. Seeing the ascendancy of Ivan, and following Byzantine traditions of Church and state unity, the Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Russias moved his residence to Moscow and built a cathedral there, ready to support Moscow princes in their political ambitions.

The expansion of Moscow's power over other Russian lands was favored also by external circumstances and pressures. By the second part of the fourteenth century the central authority of the Tartar Empire, the Golden Horde, had weakened and as was customary in Turco-Mongol society, civil wars ensued among the contenders for the throne. This situation presented an opportunity for power wise princes of Moscow to change their policy of cringing and prostration before the Tartars into that of rebellion and bargain. From now on at times they fought the Tartars, at other times they were again kneeling before them; but they now knew how to take advantage of Tartar weaknesses and how to gain new possessions with Tartar assistance. In this policy of expansion at the expense of other Russian principalities the Muscovites had the support not only of the Khans but that of the Eastern Orthodox clergy as well. Their

795  
797  
648  
793 ●  
727  
565  
651

[661]

[595]

175

## II

Following Byzantine traditions and being entirely dependent upon and identified with the dominant political power, the Russian Orthodox clergy supported the autocratic reign of Muscovite rulers by means of an apotheosis of the Czar. According to this theocratic ideology the role of the Church was to be the loyal ally and helper of the Czar who derived his authority directly from God. The Czar's judgment could be overruled by no prelate. In his effort, common with that of the Church to establish a divine order on the whole earth, the Czar had to be unconditionally supported.\*

Native Russian, Byzantine and Turco-Mongol institutions and concepts were blended in this system of Russian imperial theocracy. According to the Mongol idea of imperial power the emperor was the owner of the body and of the property of each one of his subjects. He was, however, disinterested in their souls and conscience. Thus, as far as religious beliefs were concerned, the Mongol rulers showed a great deal of tolerance; being interested mainly in collecting the tributes and not in governing they did not look at religion and clergy as allies in ruling. The shamans among the Ural-Altaic peoples were not organized as a priestly class and the Mongol emperor, even after he had accepted Islam, did not see any potential threat to his imperial power in any religion. In that system of power there was a complete separation of religion and politics.

In Byzantium, on the other hand, the Church was a powerful and well-organized force with imperial ambitions. But the Church was subdued to the imperial and personal interests of the lay ruler. The Church often succeeded, however, in using the imperial power for its own ends. At the same time the Byzantine Emperor in legal theory did not rule in his own right, but derived his authority from the people. In legal theory, he was an elected monarch and was subjected to the supreme rule of law, even if the law emanated from him. There was thus in Byzantium a well established set of laws which bound equally the Emperor and his subjects and guaranteed also certain rights to the subjects.

659  
779  
793 •177  
642

178 In the new secularized and urbanized society<sup>3</sup> also, the position  
 565 of the clergy became increasingly precarious. Like other insti-  
 793 tutions of the Czardom the Russian Orthodox Church was organ-  
 ized along the lines of sharp social differentiation and domi-  
 nance-submission relationships. Russian Orthodox clergy as a  
 whole formed a closed caste institution. All lay clergymen and  
 many monastics were recruited from among the members of the  
 [582] families of lay clergy. Endogamous marriage was practiced  
 within this caste. The church maintained its own schools for  
 [184] both the sons and the daughters of clergymen. In this manner  
 the clergy had been separated from the rest of the society and  
 had developed a sub-culture of its own. The clerics were set  
 apart from others not only by their priestly garb, but by their  
 manners, and even by their names.

792 Internally, however, within the ranks of the Orthodox clergy  
 793 there was a sharp distinction between the monastic order (black  
 554 clergy) and the secular priesthood (white clergy). The monastic  
 order was rich in land donations and other possessions and all  
 the Church hierarchy was recruited from among its ranks. The  
 secular clergy was not only subordinate to the monastics, but  
 also poor. Among the secular clergy sharp class distinction ex-  
 isted between the city clergy and the village priests. This dif-  
 ferentiation was manifested in the differences in income, educa-  
 tion and prestige, as well as in the lack of intermarriage between  
 these strata. The difference was also reflected in the attitudes of  
 the laity. While the city clergy were socially accepted by the mid-  
 [369] dle and lower urban layers, the village priests were rather iso-  
 lated from the rest of the population.

However, the sharpest difference and social distance existed  
 between the Church hierarchy and the rank-and-file clergymen.  
 The heads of monasteries, for instance, behaved like real mag-  
 nates. They took in large revenues, kept servants, horses and car-  
 riages, and hardly shared in the life of their monastic brothers,  
 even though these Church dignitaries resided in monasteries. In  
 the same way, the bishops were inclined to belittle the lay clergy  
 under their control. They treated them with a great want of re-  
 spect. They would abuse them, insult them and then even flog  
 them.

$\frac{2}{1}$  [i.e. developing in the second half of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century -- Analyst]

## REVOLT OF THE RAZNOCHINTSY INTELLIGENTSIA

• 129 •

It was this contrast between the alleged lofty calling of the minister of a privileged Church and his sad fate that must have depressed many a priest and made him bitter and resentful. Even before he became priest, while still a student in the divinity school, where he was educated at the government's expense, he was exposed to abusive treatment at the hands of his superiors. He was ill-fed, insufficiently clothed, and frequently beaten with the rod or lash. At one time these Church seminaries were so unpopular that children of the clergy had to be forced into them with the help of the knut and of the police. Embittered because of bad treatment, many of these young men nursed a grudge against their disciplinarians, as well as against the Church, the state, and the society at large. The instructors in these institutions, ill-paid and badly treated by their own superiors, were often as wretched and as discontented as their pupils.<sup>2</sup> In this manner the conditions in these institutions tended to reinforce feelings of rebellion which were nursed in the family.

As a result of such circumstances, Russian-Orthodox seminaries became a fertile ground for revolutionary political propaganda which was spreading with an increasing intensity in all the middle schools and universities of the Czardom ever since the abortive uprising of the Decembrists.<sup>3</sup> In this manner many Russian-Orthodox seminaries became hot-beds of subversive radicalism. Mutinies occurred and even attempts to assassinate rectors.

In the meantime, however, that is since 1869, services other than priesthood were opened to a priest's son. Since then the most rebellious youths from divinity schools and priestly families tended to leave church calling and engage in other activities. It was from among such rebels that many Russian revolutionaries were recruited. Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov among the "Nihilists," Nechaev among the Terrorists, Stalin among the Bolsheviks, are only a few outstanding examples in a long list of Russian professional conspirators and revolutionaries. Said Stalin:

In protest against the humiliating regime and the jesuitical methods that prevailed in the seminary, I was ready to become, and eventually did become, a revolutionary, a believer in Marxism . . .<sup>3</sup>

2 [i.e. in December, 1825 -- Analyst]

792  
793  
554  
[874]

[668]

793  
668

[443]

• 152 • THE IMPACT OF RUSSIAN CULTURE ON SOVIET COMMUNISM

565  
181 Speaking of the character of the peasants Mr. Karnovitch observed, that whoever has to exercise authority over them must above all things guard against indecision, whether in word or act. The Russian always requires a definite command; and in disputes, if the settlement be distinct and pre-emptory, he will be satisfied, whether the sentence is favorable or unfavorable, wise or unwise. If there be hesitation, he immediately becomes intractable, while a resolute command has a magical influence which he cannot resist.<sup>21</sup>

[599] In such a society which is kept together by naked force rather than by moral bonds, breakdown of controls easily results in revolt and upheavals, in widespread bloodshed and destruction. On such occasions, just like the raznochintsy intelligentsia, the peasants, too, tended to revolt against all forms of humiliation and oppressive submission and demanded reestablishment of the old community relations, in which truth and justice and equalitarian brotherhood of man prevailed.

○○○ Such forms of peasant protest, which were directed against all the authorities, the family, community elders, the landlord, the Church and the state, will be discussed on the following pages.

## 18

# RELIGIOUS REVOLT OF THE PEASANTRY

## I

[659] THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH which in the course of its history came to be completely subjected to [745] the state and was made an instrument of governing, supported 793 the lay authorities in their policies of enslavement. But the state had meagerly rewarded the Church for such services. The revenues from the land donations given to the parishes by the state or by the landlords were not sufficient to maintain the parish priests and their families. The village priests therefore depended for their living upon the fees which the peasants

## RELIGIOUS REVOLT OF THE PEASANTRY

• 153 •

had to pay for religious services: In addition many village priests had an inferior training, were often semi-literate, and were sometimes publicly humiliated by their superiors. Abased by hard conditions of life, some of them tended to lose self-respect and sought comfort in habitual drunkenness.

In the meantime as a result of the conditions of serfdom the economic situation of the peasants was deteriorating while the village priests whose main revenues consisted of fees received for their services tended to squeeze out of the peasantry all they could. Hence in many parishes the relations between the priests and the peasants gradually developed into a state of perpetual bickering and struggle.<sup>1</sup> In such circumstances peasants were likely to develop a negative attitude toward the clergy. To "have a priest's eye" meant in peasant idiom to covet everything. Similar meaning was conveyed in the phrase "Am I a priest to eat two dinners?" The peasants compared the greediness of the priests to that of the judges. "A priest waits for a rich dead, and a judge for a rich litigant"; "A judge's pocket is the same as a priest's belly," they would say. It was considered a bad omen to meet a priest on the street. It must be pointed out, also, that in a situation in which any expression of opposition against the lay authorities was very risky and dangerous, the attack against the priests might have served as a convenient substitute target for destructive aggression directed against the landlords and the state.

In such conditions government ukases and police measures were sometimes necessary to force the peasants into churches; they were made to confess and to take communion by means of threat. As a result, confession and communion tended to be looked upon as a commercialized formality. It was a tedious obligation that had to be paid for in cash, the same as all other tributes and taxes to which the peasants were subjected. In such circumstances, confession and communion tended to lose their function of consolation, comfort, relief from guilt and identification with divinity. As a result a growing number of peasants ceased to look upon the priests as their friends and protectors; they tended to look upon them as government agents who conspired with the landlords and the police against the

793

565  
793[625]  
565  
796  
793

• 154 • THE IMPACT OF RUSSIAN CULTURE ON SOVIET COMMUNISM

peasants. Such a situation in many cases bred extreme antagonism against the priests, especially when hostility against the priests was stirred up by systematic agitation, as in the case of various sects of Dissenters (*Raskolniki*). This agitation often took the form of folk songs:

[538]

hairy ones . . . the beasts:

These beasts are the priests

They howl, like wolves. . . .

In the churches they praise the Lord hypocritically,  
And ensnare innocent people with their words;  
In the churches they offer glory to God,  
And send the Uryadniks to hunt innocent people;

And they drive innocent people to Siberia.  
In the churches they open their mouths,  
But before the government they keep silent.  
Their hair is long like women's,  
But their brain is a great deal shorter.

They howl like beasts;

They extort from all.

Wicked hairy priests . . .

795  
668

[546]

The peasants were attracted to numerous sects of the Dissenters which were spreading in Russia, especially since the seventeenth century when the great movement of the Old Believers (*Starovery*) began. In these sects and their ideologies the peasants protested against the conditions of serfdom. The teachings of a number of these sects expressed yearning for a new life, and for an anarchic brotherhood of men in which nobody would be rejected and everybody accepted on equal terms. Peasant Sutayev, for instance, who founded the Sutayevtsy sect in 1880, was considered to be one of the most pious churchgoers before he revolted against the official Church. He rebelled when he was over fifty. The occasion was a dispute that he had with his parish priest over a fee for the burial of his grandson. It was after this quarrel that he stopped going to

## RUSSIA

Great Russia RF1  
103

the Monastery a great patriotic host came to its rescue under the leadership of a prince, a butcher, a monk and a Cossack, drove out the Poles, and established Michael as the first Tsar of the House of Romanov and his father Philaret as Patriarch. The House of Romanov was to last until the collapse of imperial Russia, and the advent of the Soviets. The Patriarchate was not so long lived. But in addition to Philaret himself it produced at least one outstanding figure in the vigorous personality of Nikon.

Nikon, of peasant origin, was a rigorist, vigorous and dominating, sincere and ascetic. As head of the Chudov monastery in Moscow he had been the close friend and adviser of the Tsar Alexis, the devout son and successor of Michael, for some years, when in 1652 with a good deal of reluctance and some stipulations he yielded to the Tsar's entreaties and accepted the Patriarchal Throne. Perhaps he foresaw that his own personality and conception of his duty as Patriarch were bound to clash with those of his friend and sovereign. Such in fact proved to be the case. Nikon felt himself bound in conscience to resist the encroachments of the secular power in the realm of spiritual affairs. But at the same time he had little scruple about intruding his own will into secular matters, where his harsh severity and arrogance made him many enemies among the boyars.

There was another aspect of the troubles which were to gather around Nikon and in the end overwhelm him. It was the question of the revision of the Service books of the Church—a thorny matter on which many men both in Russia and elsewhere have pricked their fingers.

The Old Slavonic books used by the Russian Church had been translated from the Greek, and in the course of centuries of transcribing, minor errors had inadvertently crept into the text. Beside these matters there were other questions in dispute, such as whether the sign of the Cross should be made with two fingers in the Russian manner or with three as the Greeks were accustomed to make it. And how often should Alleluia be sung on certain occasions? One may be pardoned some astonishment at the fury of the passions aroused by the mere discussion of these subjects. But this is to misunderstand. Men

795  
659793  
659793  
779

773  
779  
were not fighting about trivialities as such. In a sense nothing in the sphere of religion was a triviality. It is to overlook the fundamental fact that Orthodoxy was, and is, regarded by the Orthodox as one whole thing. To a man like Avvakum,<sup>1</sup> Orthodoxy, doctrine, rites, ceremonial, painting and music was one integrated whole. The slightest change in any detail was a breach in the fabric of Orthodoxy—and no such breach was to be tolerated at any price.

The question was not new in Nikon's day. A century before under Ivan the Terrible an attempt had been made to revise the Service books, and earlier still a learned Greek monk named Maxim had been brought to Moscow to undertake the work. The extraordinary history of that unhappy man reveals the intractable nature of the task in the atmosphere of ignorance, prejudice and passion which enveloped it. He came to Russia, as an invited guest, to carry out a work of scholarship. He spent thirty-eight years in Russia, twenty-six of them in captivity and sixteen in an actual dungeon, and for a long while excommunicate.

It did not ease the difficulty that the only standard by which the Russian books could be corrected was the corresponding Greek books. Russian ecclesiastics did not know Greek, and few, if any, wanted to know it. The Greeks were suspect, living now in the land of the infidel, and had they not surrendered to Western heresy at Florence, for which the judgment of God had swiftly overtaken them in 1453? Moscow was now the torch-bearer and champion of Orthodoxy, the third and final Rome, the guardian of the true faith.

No improvement in the Service books emerged from all this high feeling, and the matter cropped up again when Nikon became Patriarch. By nature an ardent reformer he would reform not only men but books.

The presence of Macarius the Patriarch of Antioch and his suite in Moscow presented an opportunity of which the Russian Patriarch was not slow to take advantage. Both informally and formally in a synod summoned for the purpose, he compared the Russian practice with the Greek and always accepted the latter as correcting the former, and the rulings

<sup>1</sup> See page 105.

Great Russia RFI

## RUSSIA

105

of the Greek visitors were acquiesced in. This did not add to Nikon's already scanty popularity, especially when he proclaimed with more honesty than tact: "I am a Russian and the son of a Russian but my faith and religion are Greek."

Even Avvakum had been prepared to amend the Russian books from the older Slavonic editions and manuscripts. But that was before Nikon's day as Patriarch, and when the latter proposed to appeal to the Greeks as the criterion, Avvakum and his friends from being moderate reformers went into the most violent and unappeasable opposition.

Avvakum was a remarkable man and he could write. He was in fact the most outstanding figure in Russian literature before Peter the Great. His autobiography which has been translated into English, should certainly be read. He defied the authorities with implacable obstinacy, goaded them with virulent abuse, suffered untold hardships as a consequence and in the end won the martyr's crown which he so eagerly desired.

In due course, the conflict between the ecclesiastical authorities and Avvakum's party (for he had many friends and sympathizers) developed into an open schism which has persisted to this day. Thus Russian Dissent, unlike English, owes its origin to opposition to reform, not to the advocacy of it. The Old Believers, as the dissenting party was called, became highly fissiparous and sometimes most eccentric. They suffered much persecution over a long period of time. "But on the whole," to quote Prince Mirsky,<sup>1</sup> "they have been the truest—in many cases the only—preservers of pre-Petrine Russian civilization. Were it not for them our contemporaries would hardly have rediscovered the Church music of Old Russia, nor the boundless wealth of its religious painting, which is the purest, strongest and most original flower of Old Russian civilization."

Nikon won against the Old Believers, but he lost against the nobility, which succeeded in detaching the sympathies of the Tsar from the Patriarch. The same Council which in 1667, in the presence of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch,

<sup>1</sup> In his introduction to *The Life of the Archpriest Avvakum by Himself* The Hogarth Press, 1924.

793 ●  
774

[795]

● 793  
106  
779

# THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

excommunicated the Old Believers, deposed Nikon himself and banished him into monastic seclusion.

793

659

The line of Patriarchs continued until 1700 when Adrian the last of the original succession died. By this time the dynamic personality of Peter the Great had appeared on the scene and inaugurated a new period in Russian history. In building the city on the Neva which bore his own name he opened his famous "window upon Europe" through which a hurricane blew which disturbed, scattered and rearranged many things in the life of the Russians. Peter admired all things Western and was determined to make Russia a great nation after the pattern of the West. So far as the Russian Church was concerned Peter's reforms had little if any effect in the sphere of doctrine, but he saw to it that bishops were appointed who sympathized or at least were ready to co-operate with his critical ideas on traditional Russian customs and who were willing to acquiesce in the subservience of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to his own autocratic will. Most important of all, he permitted no election of a successor to the Patriarch Adrian, and twenty-one years later abolished the Patriarchate altogether. The formal instrument by which this change was made was entitled the "Ecclesiastical Regulation". There were to be no more Patriarchs in Russia, instead the supreme authority in the Church was to be vested in a body formed on the German Lutheran model and known as the Holy Governing Synod.

This was no synod in the ordinary ecclesiastical sense of the word, but a committee whose members were appointed and dismissed at the will of the Tsar. In addition a secular official called the Procurator was appointed by the Emperor. This layman was not indeed a member of the synod, but his function was to supervise all its proceedings, and without his consent the synod could enact nothing, nor even choose what matters it should discuss. The bishops were dragooned into acceptance of this system, completely foreign as it was to the spirit of the Russian Church. Yet Peter's organization lasted until the collapse of the Empire in 1917.

177

186

It is an eloquent testimony to the dynamic force of Peter's personality that the impetus of his reforming movement survived his death. But it introduced deep cleavages and

## 108 THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

795

The Old Believers maintain, not without some show of reason, that it is the official Church which has left them, not *vice versa*. But in any case the vast bulk of the Russian people remained within the fold of that official Church. They lived their lives in close contact with their village churches oblivious of the disputes of Slavophiles and Westernizers, pathetically constant in their belief in their Little Father, the Orthodox Tsar, and shocked but silent if they heard of time-serving prelates. Nor were men lacking to guide and uphold them. In the eighteenth century Tikhon Zadonsky is an instance of the devout hard-working and conscientious bishop by no means rare in post-Petrine Russia.<sup>1</sup> He stayed at his episcopal post although yearning for the life of secluded devotion for which he had to wait so many years. Some reflection of this man's personality is to be seen in the portrayal of Zossima in Dostoyevsky's *Brothers Karamazov*. In the monasteries were to be found men conspicuous for their sanctity and well qualified to give advice and spiritual help to the many who sought them out. Zossima is not alone in Russian literature and the counterparts of these men in real life, such as St. Serafim of Sarov, Ambrosius of the Monastery of Optina, and many less well-known men of the kind, stand in the true line of descent from Nil Sorsky, in their spirituality and unworldliness and their essentially Russian love of freedom.

747

659

793

The vitality of the Russian Church during the period after Peter and especially in the nineteenth century found expression in widespread missionary activity (see below, p. 162). If the expansion of the Church took place together with the expansion of the Empire, if the missionary bishop worked hand in hand with the secular official and imposed Russian religion and Russian rule at the same time, who is to say which was the dominating motive? At any rate it cannot be said that the Russian Church was blind or indifferent to the spiritual needs of its pagan fellow subjects of the Tsar. But if the State was benevolently interested in the Church, it was determined to control it, and the position of outstanding men like Platon under Katharine II and Paul, and Philaret under Alexander I

<sup>1</sup> Gorodetsky: *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought*, pp. 99 ff.

was a difficult one, so long as they held high office. Each of these men was a thinker and theologian of distinction whose writings are regarded as having high authority in the Orthodox Church. Philaret in particular was the author of the celebrated *Confession* which bears his name and the translator into Russian of the Acts of the Synod of Jerusalem, with its important variations from the original (see p. 89). He was interested also in projects for educational and financial reform. But the autocratic action of the sovereign and the paralysing effect of the régime of the Holy Synod with its Procurator made it clear that the State must find more pliable material to fill the highest offices in the Church. Both Platon and Philaret were dismissed to their own dioceses and retired in official disgrace, although each of them continued to exercise great influence through his writing and preaching.

In the summer of 1917, between the March and October Revolutions, the All-Russian Church Council met in Moscow. Its members were both clerical and lay and representative of all classes within the Russian Church. It embarked upon the planning of a wide programme of administrative reform, it swept away Peter's Holy Governing Synod, and restored the Patriarchate of Moscow. Tikhon, Metropolitan of Moscow, whose name was soon to become well-known throughout the world, was appointed by lot from among three elected candidates, to occupy the Patriarchal Throne.

After the triumph of the Bolsheviks and the establishment of the Soviet Government, the world was startled to witness the attempt of a modern Government to suppress religion.<sup>1</sup> No doubt the close association of the Russian Church with the hated Tsarist régime of which it had on occasion shown itself the willing agent, helped to exacerbate the hostility with which the men who had overthrown the Tsar regarded the Church. But it is important to note that their hostility was not directed to this or that bad feature of any particular manifestation of religion, but against religion as such, and, if some of their spokesmen are to be believed, against "good" religion even

<sup>1</sup> For a balanced and judicious examination of the whole struggle, see P. B. Anderson: *People's Church and State in Modern Russia*. S.C.M. Press, 1944.